

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 36532

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2010 Unpublished Opinion No. 419
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: April 5, 2010
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
SCOTT R. AUSTIN,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. John P. Luster, District Judge.

Order relinquishing jurisdiction and order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before LANSING, Chief Judge; GUTIERREZ, Judge;
and GRATTON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Scott R. Austin pled guilty to sexual abuse of a minor under the age of sixteen. Idaho Code § 18-1506. The district court sentenced Austin to a unified sentence of ten years with four years determinate and retained jurisdiction. Following the period of retained jurisdiction, the district court suspended the sentence and placed Austin on supervised probation for five years. Subsequently, Austin was found to have violated several terms of his probation and the district court consequently revoked his probation, ordered execution of his original sentence, and again retained jurisdiction. Following the second period of retained jurisdiction the district court relinquished jurisdiction and ordered execution of Austin's sentence, but sua sponte reduced his sentence to a unified term of ten years with two years determinate. Austin filed an Idaho

Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Austin appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by relinquishing jurisdiction, executing the reduced sentence, and by denying his Rule 35 motion.

We note that the decision to place a defendant on probation or whether, instead, to relinquish jurisdiction over the defendant is a matter within the sound discretion of the district court and will not be overturned on appeal absent an abuse of that discretion. *State v. Hood*, 102 Idaho 711, 712, 639 P.2d 9, 10 (1981); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 205-06, 786 P.2d 594, 596-97 (Ct. App. 1990). The record in this case shows that the district court properly considered the information before it and determined that probation was not appropriate. We hold that Austin has failed to show that the district court abused its discretion, and we therefore affirm the order relinquishing jurisdiction.

The trial court, upon relinquishing jurisdiction, is authorized under Idaho Criminal Rule 35 to reduce the sentence. Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007).

A motion for reduction of sentence under I.C.R. 35 is essentially a plea for leniency, addressed to the sound discretion of the court. *State v. Knighton*, 143 Idaho 318, 319, 144 P.3d 23, 24 (2006); *State v. Allbee*, 115 Idaho 845, 846, 771 P.2d 66, 67 (Ct. App. 1989). In presenting a Rule 35 motion, the defendant must show that the sentence is excessive in light of new or additional information subsequently provided to the district court in support of the motion. *State v. Huffman*, 144 Idaho 201, 203, 159 P.3d 838, 840 (2007).

Applying the foregoing standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion in relinquishing jurisdiction and ordering execution of Austin's reduced sentence or by denying his Rule 35 motion. Therefore, the order relinquishing jurisdiction and directing execution of Austin's reduced sentence, and the order denying Austin's Rule 35 motion are affirmed.